

Appl. No. 10/807,724

Amdt. Dated September 23, 2005

Reply to Office Action of August 31, 2005

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office action mailed August 31, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-5 and 14 have been cancelled, and Claims 6, 15, and 17 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 6-13 and 15-21 remain pending in this application. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5-9, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,008,786 ("Costello"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As briefly mentioned above, claims 1-5 and 14 have been cancelled. Additionally, independent claim 6 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a wedge-shaped member having a first plate including a first surface, a second surface, and one or more passages extending therebetween and a bonding material impregnated through at least one of the first plate passages coupling the wedge-shaped member to the coil.

Costello relates to a dynamoelectric machine construction for maintaining and cooling salient pole windings of a salient pole rotor in a synchronous machine. The machine includes, as shown in FIGs. 1 and 2, a wedge (20) that has two walls that form a v-shaped component and a top stick (21) that is laid over the top of the v-shaped component to act as a third wall. However, Costello does not mention bonding material that is impregnated through at least one of the first plate passages to couple the wedge-shaped member to the coil.

A claim can only be anticipated if each and every element recited in the claim is disclosed in a reference, either explicitly or impliedly. Accordingly, as Costello fails to disclose, either explicitly or inherently, at least the above-noted element of claim 6 and the Examiner has failed to provide such an explicit or inherent disclosure of this element, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims and the claims that depend therefrom is improper and the Applicants request withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection.

Appl. No. 10/807,724
 Amdt. Dated September 23, 2005
 Reply to Office Action of August 31, 2005

Claims 7-9 and 13 depend from claim 6. Therefore, the Applicants rely on the arguments above for these dependent claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Costello in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,113,024 ("Pittard"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 depends from claim 6 and relies on the arguments presented above relating thereto. Moreover, Pittard does not make up for the deficiencies of Costello. Pittard teaches a v-shaped support wedge positioned between rotor poles, however, nowhere does Pittard mention or remotely suggest bonding material that is impregnated through at least one of the first plate passages to couple the wedge-shaped member to the coil.

Claims 1-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,054,790 ("Kjeer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,400,576 ("Sigmund"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kjeer relates to a V-block 24 with a preselected shape defining a preselected included angle between a pair of V-block side portions 26, 28. See abstract. The V-block includes an apex end portion 30 at a connection of the pair of side portions 26, 28 and a strut end portion 32. Sigmund relates to a deposition of rubber on the windings of magnetizable cores and teaches the use of a porous wedge 48 for use in a dynamo-electric machine. See col. 3, ll. 9 – 15. However, neither Kjeer nor Sigmund teaches or suggests bonding material that is impregnated through at least one of the first plate passages to couple the wedge-shaped member to the coil, as recited in claims 6 and 17.

The three basic criteria necessary to establish a prima facie case of obviousness are: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings, (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of

Appl. No. 10/807,724

Amdt. Dated September 23, 2005

Reply to Office Action of August 31, 2005

success, and (3) the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. However, it is respectfully submitted that neither Kjeer nor Sigmund, alone or in combination disclose all the claim limitations of at least independent claims 1, 6, and 17. For example, Kjeer and Sigmund fail to disclose, teach or suggest bonding material that is impregnated through at least one of the first plate passages to couple the wedge-shaped member to the coil, as recited in claims 6 and 17. Accordingly, as Kjeer and Sigmund fail to disclose, either explicitly or inherently, at least the above-noted element of claims 6 and 17 and the Examiner has failed to provide such an explicit or inherent disclosure of this element, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims and the claims that depend therefrom is improper and the Applicants request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, claims 7-15 depend from claim 6, and claims 18-20 depend from claim 17. Each of these dependent claims relies on the arguments presented above.

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kjeer and Sigmund in view of Pittard. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 depends from claim 6 and relies on the arguments presented above relating thereto. Moreover, Pittard does not make up for the deficiencies of Kjeer and Sigmund. In particular, no where does Pittard mention or remotely suggest bonding material that is impregnated through at least one of the first plate passages to couple the wedge-shaped member to the coil, as recited in claim 6.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 6 and 17 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

Appl. No. 10/807,724

Amdt. Dated September 23, 2005

Reply to Office Action of August 31, 2005

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 9/23/05

By: 

Cindy H. Kwacala
Reg. No. 47,667
(480) 385-5060